

## EFFECT OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS ON WASH PROGRAMS: A CASE STUDY OF CHIGUTU WASH PROGRAM IN KINANGO SUB-COUNTY, KWALE COUNTY

Habwe MUSOTSI MISHAEL<sup>1</sup> and Wilfred SUBBO<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Social Sciences - Mount Kenya University*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Anthropology, Gender and African Studies - University of Nairobi*

<sup>1</sup>*habwe.musotsi@gmail.com and <sup>2</sup>wilfred.subbo@uonbi.ac.ke*

*Submitted 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2020, Accepted 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2021, Published 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2021*

### ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to establish the extent to which availability of finances impact the monitoring and evaluation system for Compassion International Sponsored Projects Kenya Chigutu WASH programme. The study employed a descriptive survey research design. The target population was 66 employees of Chigutu WASH Programme working under the WASH programme and in human resources, finance and administration departments. Due to their small number, a census was conducted. Numerical data collected using questionnaires was coded and entered and analyzed with help of a computer Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 21 software programme. The data was analyzed using Correlation and regression where the study used Karl Pearson correlation to relate the variables. An interview guide was also used to interview key informant persons in the organization who included departmental heads, senior managers, M&E experts and consultants. The findings of the study were, in relation to the first objective found that the projects funds should have adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation activities. The availability of finances will determine what can be achieved as far as implementation, strengthening and sustainability of monitoring and evaluation system is concerned. A key function of planning for monitoring and evaluation is to estimate the costs, staffing, and other resources needed for monitoring and evaluation work.

**Key Words:** Effect, Monitoring, Evaluation and System

## I. INTRODUCTION

Globally, NGOs are currently in the process of reviewing ways in which M&E can achieve greater consistency and effectiveness (World Bank, 2008). According to UNDP (2009), M&E enable NGOs to judge the impact of projects as well as obtain recommendations on how future interventions can be improved. However, one shortcoming of the M&E system on a global perspective is that there are no set standards for measuring its quality (Chaplowe, 2008). It is therefore subjective and relies on the rule of thumb. Although monitoring and evaluation is used mainly for checking the impact of a project as well as establish whether it meets its objectives, it is also a mandatory requirement for most of donor sponsored projects where donors use them to determine effective use of their funds by recipient organizations. According to the national survey of NGOs report (2009), NGOs in Kenya received Kshs 68, 825, 005, 222.00 as funds to various projects in the year 2005/6, from different donors. The Global perspective also shows that 10% to 15% of all aid to development countries is channeled through NGOs (Askari, 2011).

In Chile, the M & E systems for public organizations were introduced in 1994. M & E systems formulation and setting up was initially tendered and left to external consultants, however, with time the government introduced methodologies and standardized measures for all agencies acting within public domain. Through the set standard measures and technologies, the agencies have been able to adopt better budget analysis and benchmarking of their performance (Rojase, 2005). In his study, Alotaibi (2011) observed that Saudi Arabia lacked an appropriate construction contractor for performance evaluation framework and the identification and exploration criteria and sub-criteria for selection of an evaluation framework. Lack of an M & E framework has a negative effect on the effectiveness of the systems which impedes the success of projects.

In Ghana, despite the numerous government's support for a harmonized monitoring and evaluation system, there have been a myriad of challenges ranging from gross financial mismanagement, lack of adequate operational and technical capacity and lack of coordination between stakeholders and those in charge of projects. To overcome this, there is need to develop better institutional capacities that will help to strengthen the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation systems (CLEAR, 2012). Ministry of youth affairs in Kenya highlights that monitoring and evaluation systems have been widely integrated in local youth projects and programs thus highlighting the success of these programs (NYSAP, 2009). Through the information sourced in the course of these projects, the management can be able to make more informed decisions as well as enhance the performance of projects. In regard to the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems in Kenya, there is lack of a standard monitoring and evaluation policy (Bornd, 2013). Bornd alludes that the majority of the baseline systems adopted are merely guidelines and policies as well as working papers written by different stakeholders. He further highlights that to address this problem, firms should increase resources allocation to M & E systems as well as involve all relevant stakeholders, enhance the capacity of the systems and ensure better communication is established within organizations. Monitoring and evaluation systems are widely hindered by both internal and external pressure and factors that manifest themselves in the project cycle as different stakeholders push for the fulfilment of their agenda (Otieno, 2014).

The major phase in the evolution of M&E in Kenya was the introduction of the Kenya Vision 2030 in 2008, replacing the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) as the country's development blueprint. Vision 2030 became the principle driver of development in Kenya and therefore the basis for National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) (GoK, 2007). NIMES was established in 2004. It was created to track the implementation of policies, programmes and projects during the Economic Recovery Strategy period, which ended in 2007. One of the problems that NIMES was to address was the inadequate supply of data for planning and policy making, particularly at lower levels (villages, locations, divisions and districts). Also, the data collected at these levels was usually forwarded upwards to respective headquarters and hardly shared vertically with other line ministries and stakeholders or fed back to lower levels. However, during its implementation, NIMES has faced a number of challenges including inadequate resources and capacities for performance tracking, weak M&E culture, weak linkages with other reform programmes, and a lack of timely and reliable data and lack of local training institutions (GoK, 2007).

Centrally executed M & E system across government is therefore a relatively recent phenomenon in Kenya, although various projects and programs incorporated notions of M&E since 1980s. A good example was the District Focus for Rural Development (DFRD) which was introduced in 1983 (GoK, 2007). Formalized M&E system was introduced with the approval of Kenya's Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (I-PRSP) in August 2000. From 2006 – 2008 performance contracting fell within the results for Kenya Program, which was implemented through the Cabinet Office (GoK, 2012). This program started to introduce service charters and reinforce a message of customer orientation in government. In the then, Ministry of Finance and National Treasury, Public Expenditure Management (PEM) was being reinforced by a number of reforms aimed at improving transparency and accountability. The Government Financial Management Act, 2004 supported Public Expenditure Management by providing a legal framework for managing public finances.

In most cases, the element of effect of M&E systems is not evidently emphasized. There has been growing pressure to improving projects performance and show results in many organizations especially those relying on donor funds. M&E is leaning towards results hence emergence of results-based M&E. This study endeavored to delve into Effect of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems on Wash Programs: A Case Study of Chigutu Wash Program

## II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Compassion International earmarks substantial resources through WASH Programmes rolled out across the country. In recent times, there has been much controversy about the management of the funds with regard to accountability; allocation, targeting and priority setting; and overall effectiveness. There have also been concerns on governance and representation, and that the Programmes had been established in a rush without preparing communities on participation in the management of the Programmes. Issues on conflict of interest were raised around the proposed structure for the management of the Programmes. The existing monitoring and evaluation (M & E) mechanisms of such Programmes are said to be weak due to poor accountability; improper procurement and tendering; over-invoicing; wasteful expenditure; and lack of openness in the budget process.

This study established the effectiveness of a M&E framework for projects: A case of Chigutu WASH Programme. The objectives of this study were: To establish the extent to which availability of finances impact the of monitoring and evaluation system for Compassion International Sponsored Projects Kenya Chigutu WASH programme.

### III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Monitoring and Evaluation are daintily particular components within the project management cycle however are exceedingly needy and commonly of noteworthy significance to extend supportability (UNDP, 1997). Monitoring is the process in which the fundamental aspects of project implementation, for example, reporting, utilization of finances, record keeping and audit of the project outcomes are periodically tracked intending to ensuring the project is being realized in accordance to the lied down strategy (Mackay, (2007). Monitoring is carried out on a persistent based to act as a driving force of proficiency inside the organization's project implementation process and its primary motivation is to develop a control mechanism for projects (Crawford and Bryce, 2003).

Besides, evaluation gives a procedure of learning. By gaining from the previous, one can enhance what's to come. Further, evaluation causes project managers to attain new skills, open up to the limit of useful self-criticism, to objectivity and to enhance future planning. Through evaluation the organization carry out a SWOT analysis since the qualities, shortcomings, openings and difficulties of the tasks are considered (Spaulding, 2014). Evaluation makes upcoming benchmarks to manage evaluations of different tasks. It likewise aid in making a learning bank for the managers which is a seamless pattern in current reality in which organization are inclining towards information the board in task the board (Calder, 2013). Fundamentally, venture observing includes an orderly and nonstop appraisal of how the task is being executed against at first set designs, exercises, and different expectations (Mulwa, and Nguluu, 2003).

It is imperative to guarantee venture supportability and for this to be accomplished, three basic measurements must be taken into accoutn; Project, institutional and ecological maintainability and furthermore family unit and community versatility. Institutional maintainability is the place utilitarian foundations will act naturally continuing after the task closes. Family unit and community strength centers around versatile networks which are ready to foresee and flexible to change via a clear leadership process, joint effort, and the managers of resource inside and outside the community. Environmental manageability thinks about that a naturally supportable system should keep up a steady resource-base, stay away from misuse of inexhaustible assets and protect biodiversity and basic change where the basic elements of neediness are tended to through the strengthening of poor people and minimized provincial families (Cooke, Bill, &Uma, 2001). Different variables, for example, outer approaches and institutional setting, will likewise affect venture observing and assessment, however are ordinarily outside undertaking control (IFRC, 2011). For instance, the supportability of network-based undertakings bolstered mediations is probably going to be imperiled in regions described by powerless establishments, absence of business sectors, absence of salary producing openings, or in delicate states encountering common clashes. (World Bank, 1980).

Projects should deliberately recognize, investigate and react to dangers in a way that guarantees continuance of project benefits once its success (Gusfield, 1975). Undertakings should look for approaches to reinforce the limit of people, family units, networks, formal and casual foundations that will enable them to adapt to future stuns (IFAD, 2005a).

Activities must not cause pollution to environment and must address the current issues without trading off the capacity of future ages to address their own issues (IFAD, 2005). M&E helps to establish the effect of an intercession. Effect alludes to the immediate or backhanded, expected or unplanned positive or negative changes delivered by an improvement intercession. Estimating the effect includes discovering the impacts of a movement on financial, social, ecological and other advancement markers. Evaluation of effect is vital in light of the fact that it creates helpful data for basic leadership process and backings responsibility for conveyance of results.

### *Availability of funds and effectiveness of an M&E system*

The project spending plan ought to give a reasonable and satisfactory arrangement for observing and assessment exercises. The M&E budgetary distribution ought to unmistakably be depicted from the principle venture spending plan so that M & E unit is agreed certain independence in usage of its assets (Gyorkos, 2003). M&E spending plan ought to be around 5% to 10% of aggregate tasks' spending which will give the M&E unit satisfactory assets to guarantee its adequacy (Kelly and Magongo, 2004). Nonetheless, according to Gitonga (2012), there is no specific percentage to be allocated for M&E but normally varies between 2.5% and 10% depending with the overall budget and the project. Gitonga further states that the more participatory M&E is, the higher its budget. Frankel and Gage (2007) concur with Gitonga by stating that there is no set equation for extent of venture's financial plan to be assigned to M&E.

Most givers and associations prescribe between 3% to 10% of the venture's financial plan. The general standard guideline is that the M & E spending plan ought not be excessively little as to affect the correctness and integrity of outcomes and neither should it expend much resources to the degree of meddling with different tasks exercises. M&E exercises and their expense ought to be evaluated and properly be gotten ready for to guarantee supports required are adequately distributed. This ought to be done at the undertaking configuration arrange with the goal that reserves are allotted explicitly to M&E and are accessible to actualize M&E errands (Chaplowe, 2008). Resources allocation should be undertaken within organizations towards their monitoring and evaluation system in a controlled manner to ensure that this does not pose a challenge to the implementation of their strategy (Mugambi and Kanda, 2013). Moreso, this should be assessed keenly for donor-funded programs where the availability of funds is not under the organization's control. Absence of adequate funds is an impediment to the achievement of the framework and process and organizations ought to guarantee they have put aside sufficient resources to help M&E exercises (Gwadoya, 2011). Oluoch (2012) likewise sees that absence of adequate finances frustrates execution of the M&E frameworks.

Public Finance Management Reform Coordinating Unit Ministry of Finance Kenya (PFMR, 2008), explains various sorts of tracking frameworks as a component of the government executives' toolkits. Each administration needs the three legged-stool of upright human resource frameworks, financial systems, and accountability frameworks. Yet, they additionally require great response systems. An outcomes founded M & E framework is basically a unique public administration instrument governments can utilize to gauge and assess results, and afterward feed this data over into the progressing procedures of administering and decision-making Cabinet.



It further delivers the credible answers to the accountability worries of partners, give public sector administrators data on advancement toward accomplishing expressed targets and objectives, and give substantial proof as the reason for any fundamental mid-course revisions in Monitoring & Evaluation strategies.

#### IV. THEORETICAL REVIEW

Theory of Change consists of a set of suppositions and conceptual projections with respect to how partners trust reality could be untold later on. This depends on a practical investigation of current setting, self-appraisal about their abilities of process assistance and a urgent and express audit of the examination, suspicions of network inclusion in observing and assessment and a procedure that helps screen deliberately and basically people and furthermore aggregate state of mind (Rogers, 2008). This theory helps to describe how altercations may occur within different stages of a project without any sure prediction being made. It further highlights how these changes can be altered through strategic intervention measures. This theory was key to the investigation as it empowers project group and partners to concentrate vitality on explicit future substances that are principal to the achievement of the project aspects.

#### V. RESEARCH METHODS

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design in an attempt to answer the research problem. A descriptive survey research design allows for an in-depth analysis and understanding of a particular phenomenon as it exists in the present condition (Cooper and Schindler, 2008). In descriptive survey research design, objectives are predetermined allowing data collection relevant and sufficient to the study problem (Kothari, 2004). By combining both quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures, descriptive research design allowed a researcher to gather exhaustive information in a way that reduces cost of the data collection. This research design therefore assisted in drawing inferences about effectiveness of a monitoring and evaluation system for Compassion International Kenya Chigutu Wash Programme. The research design was chosen due to its adequacy to fulfill the research objectives. The target population was 66 employees of Chigutu WASH Programme working under the WASH programme and in human resources, finance and administration departments. Due to their small number, a census was conducted.

##### ***Information on availability of funds***

This section covers information on the allocation of funds for M&E, statements on availability of funds and influence of availability of funds on effectiveness of M&E systems.

##### ***Allocation of funds for M&E***

The respondents were requested to indicate if the organization allocates funds for M&E activities. The findings are indicated in the Table 4.1

**Table 4.1: Allocation of funds**

Allocation of Funds	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	55	94.8
No	3	5.2
Total	58	100

From the findings, majority of the respondents, 94.8% (55) indicated that the organization allocates funds for M&E activities. A relatively small number of the respondents, 5.2% indicated that the organization did not allocate funds for M&E. The results therefore indicated that Chigutu Wash Programme in Kenya allocates funds for M&E activities. There are some few projects or instances where funds are not allocated evidenced by the small number of respondents who said ‘No’. The researcher however used other questions to determine whether there is separate sufficient allocation of funds and whether there is independency in the utilization since this is necessary for the M&E system to be strong and effective.

***Statements on availability of funds***

The study sought to determine the extent to which respondents agree or disagree with the following statements concerning M&E in relation to the organization’s projects. The responses were rated on a five-point Likert scale where: 5 – Strongly agree, 4 – Agree, 3

Not sure, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly disagree. Table 9 shows the mean and standard deviations.

**Table 4.2: Statements on Availability of Funds**

Availability of Funds	Mean	Std. Deviation
The organization provides sufficient funds for M&E activities (5%-10% of projects budget)	2.18	0.623
There is a separate budget allocation for M&E system	4.29	0.460
There is independency in the budgetary decisions for the M&E unit.	2.12	0.475
The organization ensures there is timely provision of funds for M&E	3.80	0.800

Funds allocated are used for M and E activities only

1.18

0.385

---

From the findings, majority of the respondents agreed with the statement that there is a separate budget allocation for M&E system with a mean score of 4.29. Some of the 60 respondents were not sure with the statement that the organization ensures there is timely provision of funds for M&E with a mean score of 3.80. However, majority of the respondents disagreed with the statements that the organization provides sufficient funds for the monitoring and evaluation activities (5% 10% of project budget) and that there is independency in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit with mean scores of 2.18 and 2.12 respectively.

Majority of the respondents also strongly disagreed with the statement that funds allocated are used for M and E activities only with a mean score of 1.18. This means that some projects management activities which are not part of M&E are funded from monitoring and evaluation allocation. The findings therefore show that most staff in Chigutu Wash Programme in Kenya disagree that the organization provides sufficient funds for the monitoring and evaluation activities (5%-10% of project budget) and there is independency in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit. Sufficient funding is very crucial for the system to be effective and M & E process to take place.

### ***Availability of funds and its influence on effectiveness of M&E systems***

The projects funds should have adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation activities. M&E funds should certainly be more carefully estimated and actual expenditure on the evaluation more carefully monitored and donors should put emphasis on ensuring that this is budgeted for before approving any proposal for funding.

The availability of finances will determine what can be achieved as far as implementation, strengthening and sustainability of monitoring and evaluation system is concerned. A key function of planning for monitoring and evaluation is to estimate the costs, staffing, and other resources needed for monitoring and evaluation work. It is important for monitoring and evaluation specialists to weigh in on monitoring and evaluation budget needs at the project design stage so that funds are allocated specifically to the implementation of key monitoring and evaluation tasks. Program managers often ask what proportion of a project's budget should be allocated to monitoring and evaluation. Many authors and M&E specialists recommend about 5-10% of the projects' budget. A general rule of thumb is that the M&E budget should not be so small as to compromise the accuracy and credibility of results, but neither should it divert project resources to the extent that programming is impaired.

## VI. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The study found a positive relationship between the availability of funds and effectiveness of M & E system. It found that adequate funds results to better actions during monitoring and evaluation of projects thus resulting to better M & E system. This was in agreement with James (2001) on programme evaluation standards that evaluation planning budget could certainly be more carefully estimated and actual expenditure on the evaluation more carefully monitored.



This then supports the cause for donors' keen interest with the budgetary allocation. The findings showed that M&E has separate budgetary allocation in agreement with Chaplowe (2008) but the funds were not sufficient to carry out planned activities. The amount allocated was not between 5-10% of the projects budget and the funds were not used specifically for M&E activities as Kelly and Magongo (2004) recommends. There is also no independency in budgetary decisions for the M&E unit and utilization of funds which should be the case as stated by Gyorkos (2003).

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

Regarding the first objective which endeavored to determine the influence of availability of funds on effectiveness of M & E system, the study concluded that there is a positive relationship between the availability of funds and effectiveness of M & E system. The organization provides a separate budgetary allocation to M&E activities but the funds are not sufficient (less than 5%10% of project budget). There is also no independency in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit and utilization of the funds. The organization should allocate enough funds for M & E activities. According to Jack and Samuel (2006), adequate funding needs to be devoted to implementation and running of M&E for its potential to be realized in a project. Insufficient financing is a major factor in poor maintenance of M&E processes which, in turn, is often cited as a reason for project failure. Gasper (1999) also asserts that the financing process, such as raising and maintaining adequate funds for project activities, is clearly of critical importance to the progress of a project. Chigutu Wash Programme in Kenya should ensure that adequate funds are set aside for M&E because it is from this basis that projects will have a lasting impact on the beneficiaries.

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendation based on the findings of the study:

1. The organization should allocate sufficient funds to M&E activities (5-10% of overall projects budget) and ensure there is independency in utilization of the funds.

## IX. REFERENCES

- Barasa, R. M. (2014). Influence of M&E tools on project completion in Kenya: a case of constituency development fund projects in Kakamega County, Kenya. University of Nairobi. *Unpublished thesis*.
- Alotaibi, M. (2011). Evaluation of contractor performance for pre-selection in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Doctoral dissertation*.
- Askari, G. R. (2011). Factors Influencing Effective Implementation of Monitoring And Evaluation Practices in Donor Funded Projects In Kenya: A Case of Turkana District. *Unpublished MBA Research Project*, Kenyatta University, 2011.
- Calder, J. (2013). Programme evaluation and quality: *A comprehensive guide to setting up an evaluation system*. Routledge.
- Chesos R. (2010). Automated M&E system for NGOs. The Coordinator, Issue No. 5, p. 1.
- Donaldson, S. I. (2012). Program theory-driven evaluation science: *Strategies and applications*.
- Emmanuel, Z. N. (2015). *The State of Monitoring and Evaluation of NGOs' Projects in Africa*.
- Engela, R., & Ajam, T. (2010). *Implementing a government-wide monitoring and evaluation system in South Africa*. World Bank.
- Fred Mugambi, & Kanda, E. (2013). Determinants Of Effective Monitoring And Evaluation Of Strategy Implementation Of Community Based Projects. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, Vol 2 Issue 11.
- Gaarder, M. M., & Briceño, B. (2010). Institutionalization of government evaluation: balancing trade-offs. *Journal of development effectiveness*, 2(3), 289-309.
- Kerzner, H. R. (2013). *Project management: a systems approach to planning, scheduling, and controlling*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Meri, J. B. (2013). Determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems for nonprofit projects: a case of international Non-Governmental Organizations projects in Nairobi. *Unpublished Thesis*.
- Mushori, J. (2015). Determinants of effective M&E of county government funded infrastructural development projects, Nakuru East constituency, Nakuru County, Kenya. University of Nairobi. *Unpublished thesis*.
- Olive, P. (2010). *The student's guide to research ethics*. McGraw-Hill International.
- Oluoch, S. O. (2012). Determinant of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation systems A Case Study of National Youth Service empowerment Projects (Nairobi Region). Kenyatta University. *Unpublished thesis*. Open Society Initiative for East Africa.
- Otieno, I. (2012). Impact of monitoring and evaluation systems on sustainability of community-based projects: case of Women's voices project in Siaya County, Kenya. University of Nairobi. *Unpublished thesis*.
- Pfeiffer, K. M. (2011). *Monitoring and Evaluation in the United States Government: Overview*.
- Republic of Kenya, (2012). *African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Workshop Report: Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR)*. University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Sept, 2012: www.theclearinitiative.org

- Riege, A. M. (2003). Validity and reliability tests in case study research: a literature review with “hands-on” applications for each research phase. *Qualitative market research: An international journal*, 6(2), 75-86.
- Rogito, N. O (2010). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on Projects. A Case Study of Youth Enterprise Development Fund in Marani District, Kenya). *M.A Economics unpublished Thesis*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi Press.
- Shapiro J. (2011). Monitoring and Evaluation. CIVICUS.
- Shapiro, J. (2011). *Monitoring and Evaluation Approaches*. Johannesburg. S.A.: CIVICUS.
- SIDA Report, (2014). Final Evaluation of the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation
- Silverman, D. (2010). *Qualitative research*. Sage Publishers.
- Spaulding, D. T. (2014). *Program evaluation in practice: Core concepts and examples for discussion and analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- System (NIMES) Capacity Development Project (CDP)-  
<http://www.sida.se/publications-Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency- Report on the NIMES Situational Analysis and Needs Assessment>; SIDA 2014.
- Wanjiru, W. E. (2013). Determinants of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Non-Governmental Organizations Within Nairobi County, Kenya. Kenyatta University Masters Dissertation. *Unpublished thesis*.
- Washington DC: © 2011 Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank Group.  
Washington, D.C: The World Bank, Evaluations Department.